第３講　最難関私大英語長文演習③

次の英文を読んで，問いに答えなさい。

All pilots know the importance of flying with a compass: without one, they would be in danger of straying far from course. No wonder that modern airplane cockpits are equipped with a range of dials and indicators — from compass and fuel gauge to altitude and speed meters. Pity, then, that economic policymakers have used nothing similar for charting the course of the whole economy. The excessive attention given to gross domestic product (GDP) in recent decades as an indicator of a nation's economic performance is like trying to fly a plane by its altitude meter alone: it tells you if you are going up or down, but nothing of where you are headed or how much fuel you have left in the tank. Such focus on monetary economic output has failed to reflect the growing degradation of natural resources and the inequalities of income that leave people in every society facing poverty and social exclusion. GDP's dominance has long passed its legitimacy: it is clearly time to create a better set of instruments for navigating the twenty-first century's journey toward equality and sustainability.

In 2009, Nobel prize-winning economists Joseph Stiglitz and Amartya Sen led a commission of economic thinkers to reassess how best to measure economic performance and social progress. They concluded, "We cannot function properly when the measurement systems on which action is based are ill-designed. Fortunately, research in recent years has enabled us to improve our measurements, and it is time to incorporate some of these

advances.” Standards for assessing environmental sustainability are under development — from calculating ecological footprints to quantifying natural capital.

NOTE

But a new measurement framework that focused only on bringing environmental sustainability into the picture would fail to reflect social outcomes and would overlook the social implications of pursuing sustainability. For where there is a limit on resource availability, there is always a question of how those limited resources are to be distributed and used. If that question is left unaddressed, it can result in political deadlock, injustice, and suffering. So in any discussion of what it will take to achieve global environmental sustainability, it is crucial to bring the issue of international social justice in resource distribution explicitly into the framework, including into the economic measurements to be used.

Although mainstream economics treats environmental degradation as an “external” factor that largely falls outside economic calculations, natural scientists have effectively discarded that approach and proposed a numerical set of resource-use boundaries within which the global economy should operate if we are to avoid critical Earth System tipping points. These boundaries are described not in monetary but natural measurements fundamental to ensuring the planet’s resilience for remaining in a state of balance. Yet even while the nuances of defining the nature and scale of boundaries are being debated, [1]. Human well-being depends on keeping total resource use below critical natural thresholds, but it equally depends upon every person having a claim on the resources they need to lead a life of dignity and opportunity.

NOTE

International human rights norms have long asserted the fundamental moral claim each person has to life's essentials — such as food, water, basic healthcare, education, freedom of expression, political participation, and personal security. Just as there is an outer boundary of resource use, an "environmental ceiling" beyond which lies unacceptable environmental degradation, so too there is (5) <u>an inner boundary</u> of resource use, a "social foundation" below which lies unacceptable human deprivation. Between the social foundation of human rights and the environmental ceiling of planetary boundaries lies a space that is both environmentally safe and socially just for humanity.

[From *State of the World 2013: Is Sustainability Possible?* by The Worldwatch Institute. Copyright © 2013 Worldwatch Institute. Reproduced by permission of Island Press, Washington, DC.]

NOTE

In the context of the passage, choose the best answer for each question.

(1) Choose the best expression to fill in the blank. The answer is: [1].

1 a crucial part of the picture is still missing

2 new technological innovations will solve the problem

3 natural scientists are going beyond the limits

4 the natural crisis has little to do with the economy

(2) The author mentions pilots in the first paragraph to indicate that [2].

1 the airline industry is a symbol of economic prosperity in any nation

2 business management must be bold and precise to maximize its profit

3 instrument manufactures are the first to suffer in an economic recession

4 the economy is in short supply of adequate assessments to make policy

(3) Economists Stiglitz and Sen are [3].

1 unconcerned about economic evaluations that are ill-designed

2 critical of mainstream measurements of financial performance

3 inattentive to the financial implications of environmental sustainability

4 skeptical of attempts to distribute social capital more fairly

(4) What is the author's opinion of GDP? The answer is: [4].

1 It is like flying a plane with a full panel of economic instruments

2 It does not necessarily point to the fundamental welfare of people

3 It is seldom affected by the financial difficulties of the airline industry

4 It must be analyzed to develop economic growth in the global market

(5) The phrase (5) an inner boundary refers to [5].

1 the strict border between personal freedom and political obligation

2 the vital threshold of protecting the Earth's environmental balance

3 the essential space between one human being and another in society

4 the necessary provision of resources to lead a life of dignity and opportunity

(6) Which one of the following is true? The answer is: [6].

1 Airlines do not meet new measurement standards for economic profitability

2 The problem of resource distribution is not a task for economists to address

3 Social justice cannot be disregarded any more than sustainability can be

4 The Nobel prize-winning economists support established perspectives

NOTE

第３講　解答

＜解答＞

（1）1　（2）4　（3）2　（4）2　（5）4　（6）3

＜全訳＞

パイロットなら誰もが，コンパスを使って飛行することの重要性をわかっている。それがなかったら，彼らは進路から離れてさまよう危険にさらされるだろう。現代の飛行機のコックピットには，コンパスや燃料ゲージから高度計や速度計まで，様々な目盛りや計器が備わっているのも当然である。ただ残念なのは，経済の政策立案者は，経済全体の進路を決めるのに，同様のものを何も用いてこなかったということだ。ここ数十年，国の経済状況の指標として国内総生産（GDP）に過度に関心が寄せられていることは，高度計だけで飛行機を飛ばそうとするようなものだ。それは上がっているのか下がっているのかは教えてくれるが，どこに向かっているのか，どれほどの燃料をタンクに残しているのかは何も教えてくれない。そのように貨幣経済が生み出すものに関心を集中することで，ますます進む天然資源の荒廃や，全ての社会の人を貧困や社会的排除にさらす収入の不平等を反映し損ねてきたのだ。GDP の優位性は，長い間その正当性を上回ってきた。明らかに，平等と持続可能性に向かう 21 世紀の航路を示すためのより優れた機器一式を作る時である。

2009 年に，ノーベル賞を受賞した経済学者ジョセフ・スティグリッツとアマルティア・センは，経済思想家たちの委員会を主導して，経済状況と社会的進歩を測る最善の方法を見直した。彼らはこう結論づけた。「私たちは，行動の基礎となる測定システムの設計が悪いと，きちんと機能できない。幸いにも，近年の研究のおかげで，私たちは測定基準を改善できており，こういった進歩の一部を組み込む時が来ている」と。環境の持続可能性を測る基準は，エコロジカル・フットプリントを算出することから，自然資本を数値化することへと発展しているところだ。しかし，環境の持続可能性を織り込むことにのみ焦点をしぼった新しい測定の枠組みでは，社会的結果を反映できず，持続可能性を追求することが持つ社会的影響を見過ごしてしまうだろう。資源の利用可能性に限界がある場所では，それらの限りある資源がどのように分配され，使用されるべきかという問題が常に存在する。もしその問題に取り組まないままにして

おくならば，それによって政治的な行き詰まり，不正，苦しみがもたらされる可能がある。だから，地球環境の持続可能性を達成するために測定の枠組みに何が必要となるかということに関するいかなる議論においても，資源配分における国際的な社会的公正という問題を，使用する経済的測定基準も含めて，その枠組みにつけ加えることはとても重要だ。

主流の経済学は，環境の悪化を経済計算の範囲から大きく外れる「外部」要因として扱うが，自然科学者はその手法を事実上放棄し，私たちが地球システムの重大な転換点を避けようとすれば世界経済が機能するような，資源利用の境界を数値的に設定したものを提示してきた。これらの境界は, お金の測定基準で示されているのではなく, 均衡状態を保とうとする地球の復元力を確保するのに必要な自然の測定基準で示されている。しかし, 境界の本質や基準を定義する微妙な差異が議論されているときでさえ, 全体像の決定的な部分がいまだに抜け落ちている。人間の幸福は，全体の資源利用が自然の決定的な限界値を下回るようにすることにかかっているが，それは尊厳と好機のある生活を送るのに必要な資源を要求する権利のある各人にも同等にかかっている。国際的な人権の規範は，食べ物，水，基本医療，教育，表現の自由，政治参加，そして身の安全などの生活に不可欠なものに対する，各人が有する基本的な道徳的権利要求を長く主張している。資源利用の外的な境界，すなわち，受け入れられないほどの環境の悪化がその向こうに存在する「環境上の限界」があるのとちょうど同じように，資源利用の内的な境界，すなわち，受け入れられない人権の剥奪がその下にある「社会的基盤」が存在する。人権という社会的基盤と，地球の境界という環境上の限界との間に，人類にとって環境的に安全かつ，社会的に公正な空間が存在する。

第３講　重要語彙リスト　　＊一つ一つ何度も繰り返して，覚えてください

1	stray	さまよう
2	No wonder (that) ～	～なのも当然である
3	be equipped with	～が備わっている
4	a range of	様々な～
5	indicator	計器
6	gauge	ゲージ
7	altitude	高度
8	chart	～の計画を立てる
9	excessive	過度な
10	gross domestic product	国内総生産
11	degradation	悪化
12	dominance	優位性
13	legitimacy	正当性
14	instrument	計器
15	sustainability	持続可能性
16	commission	委員会
17	reassess	再評価する
18	conclude	結論を下す
19	incorporate	組み込む
20	footprint	足跡
21	quantify	定量化する
22	framework	枠組み
23	overlook	見過ごす
24	implication	影響
25	distribute	分配する
26	result in	引き起こす
27	deadlock	行き詰まり
28	injustice	不正
29	crucial	決定的な
30	explicitly	明白に
31	mainstream	主流の
32	discard	捨てる
33	tipping point	転換点
34	resilience	回復力
35	well-being	幸福
36	threshold	境界点
37	dignity	威厳
38	assert	主張する
39	deprivation	剥奪

第３講　音読用白文　①　②　③　④　⑤　⑥　⑦　⑧　⑨　⑩

All pilots know the importance of flying with a compass: without one, they would be in danger of straying far from course. No wonder that modern airplane cockpits are equipped with a range of dials and indicators — from compass and fuel gauge to altitude and speed meters. Pity, then, that economic policymakers have used nothing similar for charting the course of the whole economy. The excessive attention given to gross domestic product (GDP) in recent decades as an indicator of a nation's economic performance is like trying to fly a plane by its altitude meter alone: it tells you if you are going up or down, but nothing of where you are headed or how much fuel you have left in the tank. Such focus on monetary economic output has failed to reflect the growing degradation of natural resources and the inequalities of income that leave people in every society facing poverty and social exclusion. GDP's dominance has long passed its legitimacy: it is clearly time to create a better set of instruments for navigating the twenty-first century's journey toward equality and sustainability.

In 2009, Nobel prize-winning economists Joseph Stiglitz and Amartya Sen led a commission of economic thinkers to reassess how best to measure economic performance and social progress. They concluded, "We cannot function properly when the measurement systems on which action is based are ill-designed. Fortunately, research in recent years has enabled us to improve our measurements, and it is time to incorporate some of these advances." Standards for assessing environmental sustainability are under development — from calculating ecological footprints to quantifying natural capital. But a new measurement framework that focused only on bringing environmental sustainability into the picture would fail to reflect social outcomes and would overlook the social implications of pursuing sustainability. For where there is a limit on resource availability, there is always a question of how those limited resources are to be distributed and used. If that question is left unaddressed, it can result in political deadlock,

injustice, and suffering. So in any discussion of what it will take to achieve global environmental sustainability, it is crucial to bring the issue of international social justice in resource distribution explicitly into the framework, including into the economic measurements to be used.

Although mainstream economics treats environmental degradation as an "external" factor that largely falls outside economic calculations, natural scientists have effectively discarded that approach and proposed a numerical set of resource-use boundaries within which the global economy should operate if we are to avoid critical Earth System tipping points. These boundaries are described not in monetary but natural measurements fundamental to ensuring the planet's resilience for remaining in a state of balance. Yet even while the nuances of defining the nature and scale of boundaries are being debated, a crucial part of the picture is still missing. Human well-being depends on keeping total resource use below critical natural thresholds, but it equally depends upon every person having a claim on the resources they need to lead a life of dignity and opportunity. International human rights norms have long asserted the fundamental moral claim each person has to life's essentials — such as food, water, basic healthcare, education, freedom of expression, political participation, and personal security. Just as there is an outer boundary of resource use, an "environmental ceiling" beyond which lies unacceptable environmental degradation, so too there is an inner boundary of resource use, a "social foundation" below which lies unacceptable human deprivation. Between the social foundation of human rights and the environmental ceiling of planetary boundaries lies a space that is both environmentally safe and socially just for humanity.